

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 20, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 14-21 are withdrawn in this application. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are rejected to by the Examiner. With this response, claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-6 and 8-21 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,661,399 to Oh (hereinafter "Oh"). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,336,535 to Fukuchi et al. (hereinafter "Fukuchi"). Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh and U.S. Patent No. 5,984,294 to Bogomolny et al. (hereinafter "Bogomolny"). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh. Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,670,994 to Kawaguchi et al. (hereinafter "Kawaguchi").

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Oh is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Oh does not disclose inherently or explicitly each element of the claims.

As an initial matter, Applicants submit that Oh is not available as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) states the following:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States,

U.S. Patent No. 6,661,399 was issued to Oh on December 9, 2003. The instant application was filed on December 17, 2003, which is less than one year after the publication date of Oh. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Oh is not prior art against the instant application under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Independent claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including “a fixing device for inserting a digitizer, wherein the fixing device has a floor part and a covering part that each receives an edge of the digitizer.” Applicants submit that Oh does not disclose at least this element of claim 1. For example, element 27 disclosed in Oh and cited by the Examiner as “a floor part” does not receive the digitizer. Applicants respectfully submit that as Oh does not disclose at least this element of claim 1, Oh does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicants note that claims 3, 5, 6, 11, and 12 each depend from claim 1 and include by reference all of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Oh does not anticipate claims 3, 5, 6, 11, and 12 based on the dependencies of the claims and for the reasons given for claim 1.

The rejections of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Fukuchi”; claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Bogomolny; claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh; and claims 4 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Kawaguchi et al are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As an initial matter, Applicants note that claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 13 each depend from claim 1 and each recite all of the limitations of claim 1.

As Applicants have discussed above, Oh does not disclose at least “a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including “a fixing device for inserting a digitizer, wherein the fixing device has a floor part and a covering part that each receives an edge of the digitizer,” as recited in independent claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner cites Fukuchi, Bogomolny, and Kawaguchi as teaching elements recited in the dependent claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 13. Applicants do not reach the Examiner’s conclusion regarding the teachings of Fukuchi, Bogomolny, and Kawaguchi. Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references including Fukuchi, Bogomolny, and Kawaguchi, cure the deficiencies of Oh with respect to the above-identified combination of elements recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that as Oh, Fukuchi, Bogomolny, and Kawaguchi, analyzed singly or in any combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1, claim 1, and claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 13 depending from claim 1 are each allowable over Oh, Fukuchi, Bogomolny, and Kawaguchi.


Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 16, 2007

By 
Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No. 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants